

LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of Workshop Meeting held March 12, 2013

A workshop meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Lower Paxton Township was called to order at 5:25 p.m. by Chairman William B. Hawk, on the above date in the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Center, 425 Prince Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

Supervisors present in addition to Mr. Hawk were: William C. Seeds, Sr., William L. Hornung, Gary A. Crissman and David B. Blain.

Also in attendance was George Wolfe, Township Manager; Steven Stine, Township Solicitor; Brian Luetchford, Parks and Recreation Director; Christine Hunter, H. E. Black and Heroes Grove Committee; Sam Robbins; Public Works Director; Matt Miller, Field Engineer, Public Works Department; Steven Fleming, HRG Inc.,; and Watson Fisher and Ted Robertson, SWAN.

Pledge of Allegiance

Mr. Hawk suspended the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance as it was recited during the Sewer Authority Meeting.

Public Comment

No public comment was presented.

Review of a proposed letter of agreement between the Township and Heroes Gove

Mr. Luetchford introduced Christine Hunter from the Heroes Grove Committee. He explained that he wanted to review the draft letter to Chief Martin regarding verbal discussions and agreements regarding this project with the Board members. He noted that the Parks and Recreation Board had a concern that these items be put into writing and documented. He explained that Chief Martin is the current president of the Heroes Grove Committee. He noted that the letter indicates a number of items to be considered, general understandings, and details worked out to date. He noted that it indicates that the Heroes Grove Committee will fully cooperate with the Township in all matters of planning and construction. He noted that the construction will follow building codes and nothing will be built or improve without the written approval of the Township working through staff, Parks and Recreation Board and the Board of

Supervisors. He noted that it states that the project will need written approval from the nearby shopping center to support the construction and operations and number five states that the Committee will provide the Township with detailed construction plans at the earliest possible date. He noted that change orders will be approved by the Township and construction insurance will be provided and all improvements will become the property of the Township making it the Township's responsibility to maintain all those improvements. He noted that the Committee will conduct fundraising during the construction phase and also for the purposes of assisting the Township with maintenance costs, and lastly the activities will be scheduled by the Parks and Recreation Department. He noted that Heroes Grove will be entitled to conduct activities on three different dates during the year for memorial services and events on Veteran's Day, Memorial Day and September 11th. He noted that the final statement notes that the agreement can be amended by mutual consent as necessary. He noted that many of the items will need to be amended in the future as the project moves forward.

Mr. Luetchford noted that is the intent of the letter to memorialize the agreement noting that it will probably be an evolving document. He noted that he is looking to move forward with a signed document and questioned if the Board wanted to make any changes at this time. He noted that the Parks and Recreation Board has reviewed the current document and is in agreement with it.

Mr. Crissman questioned if staff is in complete agreement with everything that is in it. Mr. Luetchford answered yes. Mr. Crissman noted that he has an issue with item five. He suggested that "earliest possible date" language is nebulous; however he has an issue with the last line. He questioned if all three groups are to initial and date their consent to the plan to show that nothing has been bypassed. Mr. Luetchford noted that he can make it part of the process.

Ms. Hunter noted that the Committee is in agreement and this is the way she envisioned the process working, as she wanted to get it started. She explained that she met with Township staff about a year ago and this is the process that was set up at that time.

Ms. Hunter noted that she wanted to clarify by whom the written approval of change orders would be authorized. Mr. Hawk noted that he attends the Committee's meeting on an infrequent basis and they have been working very hard on this. Ms. Hunter noted that during construction you don't always have the time to wait until a Board of Supervisors meeting to get

the approval. She questioned if there could be an understanding between the Board and Mr. Luetchford for what he could or could not approve. Mr. Crissman noted that is why this must be memorized in writing to have a clear process. He noted that any work for the Township that has a change order requires Board approval. He noted that it would be consistent with the practice, but it may constitute a hold until that occurs based upon the Board's meeting dates.

Mr. Hawk noted that this agreement could be put on the agenda for the next Board business meeting.

Mr. Crissman suggested that between Mr. Luetchford and Ms. Hunter they could clean up statements five and six. Ms. Hunter questioned item number four, that written approval of the shopping center parking lot and construction and facility operations have been secured. She noted that we are working on getting an agreement with the shopping facility, but questioned if she would need to seek the Shopping Center's approval for facility operations. Mr. Luetchford answered that we will have a facility that will clearly need parking, and currently, Brightbill Park visitors do park in the area next to the JoAnn Fabrics store on the Shopping Center property. He noted if we have a service or concert or some other activity, people will park in that area. He noted that it was his assumption that there would be parking support by the shopping center but there is a question mark for that issue. Ms. Hunter noted that there is a question if they will pledge that parking area and she needs to ask them if people could park there. She noted that there is parking at the Friendship Center, and there is handicapped parking on the Township land which will have access to the facility but the shopping center would be closer than the FC parking lot.

Mr. Crissman noted that we could have a conflict for parking at the FC with people using it. He noted that the statement says written approval of parking lot and land usage for construction and facility operation shall be secured prior to commencement of construction activities. He questioned if any of this has occurred yet. Ms. Hunter noted that she has been in contact with the shopping center owners and received a very receptive attitude; an easement for construction activities has been forwarded to their legal department. She noted that she did not have any indication that it would not be approved. Mr. Crissman noted that he is hearing that you will have usage of the area for the period of construction time. Ms. Hunter noted that the access through the parking lot for construction vehicles is possible. Mr. Crissman noted that is for

construction only at this time. He questioned if they are unwilling to commit for parking at this time. He noted if we want people to attend and participate in the programming, and have no parking for them, where do they go. Ms. Hunter noted that it was her sense that it is a part of the park so they need to park in the park. Mr. Luetchford noted that there are lower and upper levels for parking in Brightbill Park's parking lot. Mr. Crissman noted if that is true, then statement four needs to be modified as it uses the word "shall be secured" and he noted that the key is for facility operation. Ms. Hunter noted that it did not jump out to her before for operational concerns as the large parking area is not Township land. Mr. Luetchford questioned if it would be acceptable for the Board to sign a letter that says that you provide parking lot use for construction but not mention operation. Mr. Crissman noted if we have a big Fourth of July celebration and people start using that lot, would the shopping center complain as they have the right to deny anyone to park there. He questioned if we are creating a conflict. Mr. Luetchford answered that people who play baseball and attend current concerts in the park in that area now as they walk down to the park. He noted that there may be about 50 cars parking there now and they haven't denied it but they have the right to deny it. Mr. Crissman questioned if they are simply tolerating the 50 or 60 cars that are there now but when they get 200 or 300 cars for a concert then they may complain to the Township.

Mr. Luetchford noted that we have a similar situation with the New Love in Christ Church adjacent to the Ranger Park, noting that we use the Township provided parking lot and the overflow uses the church parking lot. He noted that the Parks and Recreation Department do not schedule activities on Wednesday evenings or Sunday mornings. He noted that we have paved the church parking lot for them noting that it is used by the soccer people and other organizations. He noted that it is hard to determine what parking is for the church and what is for the Township Park.

Ms. Hunter questioned how often will there be programs. Mr. Luetchford answered that there will be weekly concerts in July and baseball uses the fields now and it is hard to tell how often the area will be used.

Mr. Hawk questioned if Mr. Luetchford could tweak the letter to accommodate the need. Mr. Luetchford noted that the Board needs to consider if it wants to put a facility in Brightbill Park directly next to a parking lot that is privately owned by a commercial plaza when a potential

for conflict exists. He suggested that it might impact going forward with the project. He noted that the property owners may not like people using the parking lot.

Mr. Hawk noted that the FC is a little bit of a walk from the Heroes Grove facility. Mr. Luetchford noted that there is discussion for putting handicapped parking on the existing former inline hockey court so that could be taken care of on Township property. He noted that it was not built for parking. He noted that we could reorganize the parking for Brightbill Park in some other way.

Mr. Seeds noted that the FC is on the agenda this evening and there could be ramifications from whatever becomes of the FC as far as the entire area and the softballs fields. He noted that there has been discussion to relocate the softball fields as well. He noted that there are many ramifications to many items for any decision made for the FC. He stated that he did not know how many parking spaces are at Brightbill Park and if it would accommodate concerts. He noted that we don't have answers for the scenarios that could come up.

Mr. Hawk noted that parking is the main consideration.

Ms. Hunter noted that we need to talk about it now then have issues later. She noted that she will work on the agreement and come back to the Board. Mr. Luetchford noted that we need to have more discussions with the mall owner. Mr. Crissman noted that numbers 4, 5, and 6 have to be resolved.

Review of amendments to the bylaws of the Dauphin County Tax Collection Committee

Mr. Hawk noted that the amendments are housekeeping items on behalf of the Dauphin County Tax Collection Committee to ensure that they are in compliance with Act 32. He noted that any amendments to the bylaws must be ratified by the Township. He noted that any delegate to the Committee has the full scope of authority and is not in a conflict of interest. He noted that issue was settled when the people were appointed. He noted that everyone on the Committee has a fiduciary responsibility. He explained that the Executive Committee will make various recommendations and put things into play but it must be approved by the full board at the next meeting and a budget has to be established by the Committee. He noted that these various items bring the Committee into compliance with Act 32.

Mr. Seeds questioned Mr. Hawk if he recommends the amendments. Mr. Hawk answered that he does as he is the representative to that Committee from the Board of Supervisors. He noted that there is a conflict of interest policy as well as a whistleblower policy.

Mr. Seeds made a motion to approve the amendments to the Dauphin County Tax Collection Committee. Mr. Wolfe noted that we do not need to approve this as the Committee will approve it as long as the Township does not provide any negative comments.

Continued discussion regarding operational and financial
Management issues affecting the Friendship Center

Mr. Wolfe noted that he is having technical difficulties and will be unable to display the power point presentation for all present.

Mr. Wolfe noted that there were issues raised in that the Friendship Center (FC) was not meeting its initial financial projection that was develop many years ago. He noted that he provided information to the Board in regards to the cost and revenue centers that was discussed during the February workshop session. He noted at that point the Board raised two questions, should the Township continue to operate the Friendship Center and if so, what changes need to be made to the organization structure, facilities, amenities, and operating procedures.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the FC was open in January of 2000 and it is now 13 years old. He explained that the FC was to operate as a facility of the Township under the Parks and Recreation Department; exist as an enterprise fund within the Township's financial structure; be constructed using a \$2 million grant from the Township, having \$5 million in general obligation bonds and receive funding from the Harrisburg East Senior Center Action Committee (HESCAC), totaling \$750,000, part of which were grant funds obtained by that organization. He noted at that time, the FC was to be financially self sufficient, to include the payment of the annual debt service, with the Township providing \$100,000 per year in recognition of the Parks and Recreation space housed in the Center.

Mr. Wolfe noted that those premises were put together 15 years ago and from that the FC was built and began operations. He noted that the Board, through Resolution 99-06; established the Friendship Center Operating Board (FCOB) who's duties were: review operation of and improvements to the FC; participate in the development, management, and evaluation of programs; solicit the general public for opinions regarding the FC; resolve customer complaints

as they occur; prepare operating and capital budgets; recommend memberships, programs, and rental rates; develop and maintain a capital plan; conduct fundraising and promote endowments and trusts; investigate sources of state and federal funding; and develop and maintain rules, regulations and policies. He noted the FCOB has been doing this on behalf of the Board for the past 14 years.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the FC has had operating audits, the most recent conducted by Ballard King and Associates in 2012. He noted that Ballard performed the first operating audit roughly five or six years before that and was also involved in the original market area analysis for the FC in the late 1990's.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Ballard King reported in 2012 the following strengths: the center continues to have a very high rate of cost recovery that is the top 5% of financial performance of any public recreation center; the facility has a relatively small full-time staff to operate and manage the center; the center manages its operations budget very well, ensuring that the costs are controlled and revenues are maximized; the center is clean and well maintained; the center has strong operating policies and procedures in place; and a high level of programming is offered by the center. Mr. Blain questioned what it means in regards to the high rate of cost recovery. Mr. Wolfe noted that compared to public recreation centers this consultant deals with on a nationwide basis; the FC is in the top 5% of cost recovery. He noted that public recreation centers are typically not built to be financially self sufficient. He noted that we were told that at the very beginning of the project many years ago; however we chose to set the Performa requirement that the FC be self sufficient even though Ballard King stated that we could not do it. He noted that compared to others, the FC is at the top 5% for recovery. Mr. Blain noted of the revenues we charge, we can cover x amount of cost. Mr. Wolfe noted that what Ballard King is stating that compared to other centers we are making more money versus our cost of operation. He noted that financial support from the municipality and most facilities have 50/50 where they generate 50% of the revenues and received 50% of support from the governing body; however, in the FC's case it generates 90% of the revenue, receiving 10% of the support from the governing body and he finds that to be very unusual.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the weaknesses were found to be: increasing maintenance demands to keep the center in top condition due to the age of the facility; the center has a lack of storage

and office space; limited staff makes it more difficult to have adequate time to handle all the required administrative tasks, as well as facility operations and recreation programming responsibilities; and is becoming increasingly more difficult for the center to meet its financial goals that it be self-sufficient including the satisfaction of debt service.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Ballard King also reported that the center is well utilized and this is particularly true for the pool and fitness area. He noted that due to their size, the gymnasium, social hall and outdoor patio are underutilized. He noted that the social hall, pool, and gymnasium don't make money; however, where the FC makes the biggest bang for the buck is in the classrooms and fitness center. He noted that the senior area has an acceptable rate of use, but it could be higher especially during the afternoon and evening hours. He noted that there is a contract for that space and it is used as the FC Senior Center during the day. He noted that a capacity analysis should be completed for each major space in the building to determine the current percentage of utilization. He explained that staff took the first step for what it presented to the Board during the February workshop session for information on cost and revenue centers.

Mr. Wolfe noted that facility and alterations from the Ballard King 2012 Report showed that long range plans should be developed to increase storage and administrative office space. He noted that this has a low priority. He reported that the weight/cardio equipment is no longer "state of the art", and it is difficult to compete in the market without top of the line equipment. He noted early on in the design process, it was noted that the fitness center would be the revenue center and should be expanded. He noted that the locker rooms need to be upgraded in the future and massage therapy needs a better location in the building. He noted that the outdoor pool deck receives little use and a consideration should be made to consider a spray ground. He noted that the other comment concerned if the Wi-Fi should be made available in the center again. He noted that this has already been accomplished.

Mr. Wolfe noted that was a summary of where we began and what a consultant has suggested for where we are in the beginning of 2012. He noted that he put some options together in regard to organizational and operating structures.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the first option would be to maintain the existing facility as it is without change except to recognize the fact that the original assumption of self sufficiency was overly aggressive. He noted that we are at a 90% rate of cost recovery and we may have to live

with that current condition. He noted that it would require a General Fund subsidy of the operating budget for the FC. He noted that there is a need to reimburse the FC for its costs in regard to the operation of the Senior Center which is a separate entity. He noted if the Board chose this option, the FC Operating and Capital budgets in total would require \$200,000 more a year which would be a little less than 10% of the FC annual operating budget.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Option 2 would be to sell or lease the FC on the open market. He noted that it must be a competitive bid and should satisfy an existing debt of \$4.6 million to include the 2013 bond issue. He noted that a sale could result in a change of use and the FC Senior Center must be maintained in its existing form per the contract with Area Agency on Aging. He noted that the contract lasts roughly another ten years. He noted that the Township would no longer operate the FC.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Option 3 would be to sell or lease the FC to a private non-profit organization that would provide community services. He noted that the Board could do this through negotiations as competitive bidding would not be required. He noted that the Township would continue to have its outstanding debt and the value of the building and we would have the issue of the Senior Center as an annex portion of the building that must be maintained, but the results would be that although the Township does not operate the FC it would be ensured to be used as a recreational facility.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Option 4 would be to contract for FC management, using a professional service and this is something that could be negotiated. He noted that it would not affect the current inefficiencies that exist in the public sector such as collective bargaining or procurement nor the positives that we have like tax exemption or grant funds that we would continue to receive. He noted, in the general Central Pennsylvania area, there are two companies that provide sports center management, SportsPlex Management Group operates indoor complexes in Pennsylvania, Maryland and New Jersey. He noted that Global Spectrum, a subsidiary of Comcast-Spectacor, operate facilities like the Giant Center with 90 facilities in the United States and Canada. Mr. Blain noted that they operate the Wells Fargo Center in Philadelphia and owns the Philadelphia Flyers. He noted that the Township would no longer manage the operations of the FC but is would continued to be used as a recreational facility.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Option 5 would be a transfer of management to an LPT Authority. He noted that the FC would be under LPT Municipal control and it would create an Authority Board through a management agreement or through a transfer of right. He noted that there would be the same collective bargaining issues and procurement issues and abilities to get grants and tax exemption. He noted that the Operating Board would provide complete control and the Board of Supervisors would have no hand in it at all. He noted that we would continue to have the Senior Center but the recreational facility would be ensured.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Option 6 is to revamp the financial assumption, after some discussion, to be considered in terms of actual operating experience as opposed to an assumption that was developed with no experience at all. He noted that you could reconstitute the Operating Board to give it more or less authority, invest in areas of the center that have been identified as profit centers, the weight and fitness area in expense of the social hall and or gymnasium. He noted that a second alternative would be to develop the outdoor deck area outside the natatorium for more recreational activity as opposed to a sun deck area. He noted that you would want to reduce to the extent possible, areas of operation that have been identified as economically inefficient. He noted that staff would need an additional study by the Board to determine that and it would be good to retain a consultant in that effort.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he and Mr. Luetchford would like to provide some additional information in regard to the Pennsylvania Community Center Recreation that are either operated by governmental entities or by non-profits except for those that would be operated by a YMCA.

Mr. Luetchford distributed a 11 x 7 document indicating a survey that he conducted with various community centers state-wide. He noted that some were built a long time ago and others were recently built. He noted that there are seven, with the first being the Greater Plymouth Community Center that was built at almost the same time as the FC by the same architect. Mr. Wolfe noted that we did not pick and choose community centers, for as far as free standing facilities not counting YMCA's, these are all that we know of in Pennsylvania.

Mr. Luetchford noted that the ten columns list the age of the facility, if it is municipally owned, the cost of construction, description of building, the budget information, combined with a Parks and Recreation Department, Chain of Command, major source of revenue, membership revenue and program revenue. He noted that the first three on the list are municipally owned, and

the last four are 501c 3's and are all located in Lancaster County. He noted that the Ephrata Center was one of the first built in Pennsylvania 35 years ago. He explained that the Plymouth Center was built by the same architect and roughly at the same time; however they recently expanded their fitness center and Bethlehem Township wants to expand their fitness center. He noted that Upper St. Clair has a fitness center that is 10,000 square feet whereas the FC is only 4,000 square feet. He noted that the New Holland Center has an emphasis on the fitness center and wants to expand, whereas the Ephrata Center converted an area and as a second phase, wants to expand as well. He noted that the fitness center is a theme for expansion for all of the facilities.

Mr. Luetchford noted for the budgets, many are in negative numbers with Plymouth not meeting its expenses, Bethlehem Township is slightly positive, and Upper St. Clair is positive but it gets 15% of the budget from the Township just like Plymouth. He noted that Lititz and Hempfield have positive numbers and New Holland and Ephrata having negative numbers. He noted that Hempfield receives \$100,000 in municipal support, and doesn't have any debt. He noted that they have a very well known tennis center.

Mr. Luetchford explained that there are various chains of commands as to who they report to, either an operating board, the township manager, or board of supervisors.

Mr. Luetchford noted under budgets many have recently converted to an all inclusive membership that includes a core group of fitness classes. Mr. Hornung requested Mr. Luetchford to explain. Mr. Luetchford explained, instead of having a membership and paying for every program that is offered, which is what we do at the FC: however, it is deemed appropriate by Ballard King and others to compete with the market, to provide a free program with the membership. He noted that it starts with a core group of fitness classes, a premium membership that allows that to happen at a higher expense. He noted that staff has started in that direction already by allowing walk-ins to take a class that is not full and pay a fee. He explained that staff started to implement that in January of this year. He noted that the problem with a premium membership is that staff calculated, last fall, that if it went in that direction this year it would have a chance of losing \$70,000 during the transition. He noted that the memberships won't keep up with the loss in the transition. Mr. Wolfe noted that there would be a transition period that

could take two or three years. He noted that it could cost \$70,000 per year in losses until the transition is completed and then it would create a more positive flow.

Mr. Luetchford noted that the two main themes were to expand the fitness center and move to an all inclusive membership.

Mr. Seeds questioned if any of the facilities require that the person must be a Township resident. He suggested Upper St. Clair won't let you use their park system unless you are a resident and they charge a fee. He questioned if they do the same thing for a community center. Mr. Luetchford noted that they have resident and non-resident fees. He noted that they all allow non-residents to use the facilities.

Mr. Wolfe noted that none of the facilities on the list were built to be financially self sufficient. He noted that we are the only ones who ever developed a facility that he is aware of with that premise. He noted that is why we are here because we are not meeting that premise, but the facilities that are on the list were not built with that in mind. He noted that we have shown you the options that we have and are the resource to provide the Board with information.

Mr. Seeds noted that he normally used the center in the evening but now he goes over in the day and he was surprised to see how busy it is. He explained that he was told that people are lined up at 5:20 a.m. to sign up for programs. He noted that sometimes there is hardly any room to get into the pool. He questioned why we are in such a financial need with all the people using the facility.

Mr. Wolfe noted that it is one thing to say that we are not meeting our financial projection as we are projected to be financially self sufficient, but it is another thing to say that because we are not meeting it that we are not successful. He noted that they are two different things. He explained that we have a successful facility that is well utilized, and can't program any more use in the building due to the programs being full, and memberships, although they have dropped during the recession, have remained stable at about the 1,500 level. He explained that the facility is used well; however, it is not meeting its initial financial projection. He noted to assume that it is an unsuccessful facility because it doesn't meet the financial projection is not related. He questioned if we could do more to get more people in to raise revenue, yes, but it doesn't mean that the facility is under utilized. He noted that it is not a utilization issue, but a financial issue based upon the way the facility was built and how it is operated.

Mr. Hawk noted that the Ballard King report points out that it is well run and well utilized but not meeting the financial expectations. Mr. Seeds noted that not only do the seniors have those programs called Healthways but they also have it for individuals through their employers. He noted that the FC is taking a big cut in some instances with families or single members; it is not only the seniors. He noted that we accept less from the seniors because if we don't they will go somewhere else. Mr. Luetchford noted that the rate is set up per visit being \$3 or \$4 per visit. He noted that depending on how often a person shows up we could end up with a lot less than the membership rate. He noted if you have a membership you pay whether you show up or not, but now it is based upon how many visits you make noting that we may only get \$12 a visit as compared to \$30 for a monthly membership. He noted if you don't accept the membership then they will go elsewhere.

Mr. Seeds questioned if Mr. Luetchford had any numbers to show from one year to the next how much difference it made using the insurance membership. He noted that the center looks as busy as it ever was.

Mr. Hornung questioned if it is worth it. Mr. Luetchford explained if a membership is not accepted of which most are senior citizens, they usually come during the day, so it does work out. He noted if you don't take those types of memberships, they may go elsewhere. He noted that it is not a financial gain for the FC, providing less of a payment per person. He noted that a senior citizen could pay \$30 per month, and the average payout for monthly insurance is \$10. Mr. Hornung noted that they are getting away with paying \$10 for what the normal rate would be \$30. Mr. Luetchford noted if they show up ten times a month then it is a wash or you could get more than that. Mr. Seeds noted that we did not have these issues back in 2000. He noted that when the FC was built there was no competition. He noted that everyone has a facility now and there is competition with the Center trying to maintain with less costs. He noted that the other facilities don't have union employees and management.

Mr. Blain noted when the FC was built in 2000; it was built as a community-type center that was family orientated. He noted that you talk about competition, but back then you still had gyms that people could go to and work out. Mr. Seeds stated that there were not as many. Mr. Blain noted that it was not built to compete against those gyms and today it is still not meant to compete against those gyms. Mr. Crissman noted that Ballard King noted that it is family

orientated. Mr. Blain noted that we must be cautious with this discussion as it was never our niche to go after single people who want to work out. Mr. Luetchford noted that the other places are largely for the single adult market.

Mr. Blain questioned when the center first opened, how many memberships were there and how many were family memberships. Mr. Luetchford answered that we quickly moved up to 2,000 memberships and roughly half were family memberships. Mr. Blain questioned, of the 1,500 we have today, how many are family memberships. Mr. Luetchford answered that it is a lesser percentage because the senior citizens memberships have changed. Mr. Wolfe noted at this time, the annual membership's total is 1,500 and monthly membership which would include the Healthways total about 900 with the total memberships at the 2,500 level. He noted when we first opened we did not sell monthly memberships only annual memberships. He noted 18 months into the operation we developed short term memberships. Mr. Blain noted that he does not know what the memberships are with LA Fitness or Gold's Gym but he would bet that it is not family memberships. He suggested for them, their memberships are for people who are going to get their work out in, probably single persons. He noted that the population of those gyms is a lot different than what our niche is for the FC. He noted that you have to be careful when you are comparing against Gold's Gym; you can't as they have a different trade.

Mr. Blain noted that one option was to increase the size of the fitness center and although it is a profit center we don't want to make it a non-profit center by making it too big and not being able to support it with what we have. Mr. Hawk noted that those other gyms were built for a totally different concept as a workout place and you don't have a pool except for Central Penn and the YMCA. Mr. Luetchford noted that is why we did a state-wide survey to compare the FC to the correct type of facility.

Mr. Wolfe noted that a community center like the FC is just that. He noted that it provides recreational, learning, and social opportunities and in some fashion it is an indoor park. He noted that it was never built to compete with a public health club or fitness center. He questioned, do we share the same market, yes that is obvious; however we don't operate for the same purpose.

Mr. Crissman noted in regards to the family or single concept, with the swimming pool, we use it as an educational facility and not just an opportunity to swim laps. He suggested that

we should generate a lot of revenue from the aquatics programs for adults and children as those kinds of activity are not replicated anywhere else. Mr. Wolfe noted, much like a township park, we provide for Youth recreation leagues and competition through the LPAC swimming program. He noted that they pay rent to use the center, and they pay it at a below market rate as established by the FCOB because it is a youth recreation activity that benefits families in the community.

Mr. Seeds noted that he was thinking about the people who were lined up in the early morning hours to register their kids as we must be the only game in town for those programs. He questioned if there were other places that they could get the same programs. Mr. Luetchford answered that preschool programs in half day play or other nursery schools can provide some of those services. He noted that it is not exactly the same as there is no other place providing a place for senior citizens. He noted that they also don't provide preschool classes and learn to swim classes. He noted that they have a special place in the community and the center is the place that houses those programs.

Mr. Seeds questioned if we are charging enough for the programs. Mr. Luetchford answered that staff does compare its programs with others to see if the cost is at or below the market rate. Mr. Wolfe noted that the closest entity that we have in the Harrisburg area is the YMCA and they had their 501c3 non-profit flyer in the Sunday paper and if you check their rates of operation, the family membership is \$750 and the FC is \$720.

Mr. Seeds noted that Upper Dauphin fees are a lot less. Mr. Luetchford explained that they do not offer the same kind of space or programs. Mr. Seeds noted that they have a pool.

Mr. Hornung questioned Mr. Luetchford if there would be a demand to restructure the space. Mr. Luetchford answered that he believes so as we have areas that we have maxed out the space. He noted that there is a lot of demand for space noting that we can't expand our programs to other spaces, especially during high use time which is when the demand occurs. He noted that if you want to exercise at six in the evening there is only so much space available. He noted that the success rate of the FC to expand into other areas show that the profit centers will work for certain areas. He noted that we could make better use of space and the Ballard King Report stated the same thing.

Mr. Crissman requested Mr. Luetchford to be specific with Mr. Hornung for what has been discussed in using the open space behind the desk for a fitness center. Mr. Hornung noted

that we are looking for another \$100,000 in revenues to make this work. Mr. Wolfe noted for operations and capital, for the past three or four years, the FC has been short \$200,000. He noted that the first five years of operation when there was no need to invest in capital, we banked money and that capital fund will be depleted the end of this year. Mr. Hornung noted that sometimes government is frustrating if you mix the capital improvements and there has been the move to leasing... Mr. Wolfe noted that we continue to pay that out of capital as well. Mr. Hornung noted that the \$200,000 would be a mix of both capital and operating expenses.

Mr. Hornung questioned if the extra demand to replace the \$200,000 should be by increasing memberships. Mr. Luetchford noted that he does not know but it would be moving in the right direction as this is what he has been told by others.

Mr. Hawk noted from the financial breakdown that the Board received last month, the fitness center and the classrooms are the money makers and he noted that Mr. Hornung alluded that if more space was available for these two items, it may increase the revenue but you will never know until you try it. He questioned how much do we utilize the gymnasium area or is a lot of that space available for expansion of programs. Mr. Luetchford answered that Ballard King identified that area as being slightly underused, noting that the audit was done in July when many people are outside playing basketball. He noted that that area along with the social hall and some other lighter used areas are to be looked into to determine what we could do to improve the use.

Mr. Blain noted that we are not sure if any changes to the internal structure or design will increase revenues. Mr. Luetchford noted that he must rely on the testimony of people who have done this and our own consultant suggests this. Mr. Wolfe noted that we are not sure.

Mr. Hornung questioned how much income the FC receives for programs. Mr. Luetchford answered that it is about \$300,000 a year. Mr. Hornung noted that we would not get another \$200,000 if we increased the programs. Mr. Luetchford noted that he would have to double the space to do that. Mr. Hornung questioned if we double the space what are the chances of getting that many additional programs filled. Mr. Wolfe answered that you must be careful for how you do it, noting the only way to do that would be to take out a bay of the gymnasium. He noted if you pull a curtain across you would have the space but not full utilization because it is not desirable space. He questioned how much are we willing to spend and then you take the

\$200,000 and made it \$300,000 to amortize the debt service because you had the capital investment... Mr. Hornung noted if there is no chance that we will get more people in no matter how much we spend there is no use going down that road but if we were to come up with enough programs to meet the needs noting that some of the remaining \$200,000 could be made up by additional memberships as a result of the programming. He suggested that you would get \$130,000 for programs and the rest would be memberships as a result of the programs. He noted if we got another additional \$130,000 in programming, could we make up the costs of what it would take to do it. He noted if it is possible, there may be other areas that will have to be funded, is it possible to make it happen. Mr. Luetchford answered that some of the suggestions made tonight for programming and memberships and areas of popularity and interest, those are the things we should be exploring with a combination of multiple things that may bring us to where you are talking. He stated that he needs to get more information and have the consultant confirm what the Board is thinking.

Mr. Blain explained to Mr. Hornung that we must remember that we are not talking about generating enough revenues to make up a shortfall or deficit to break even; he noted that they don't have any capital funds to replace equipment, roof, HVAC and do any of that work. Mr. Wolfe noted that it would be part of the \$200,000. Mr. Blain questioned how much more would you need going down the road. Mr. Wolfe answered that the capital plan states that the FC needs \$170,000 in capital each year for the next 20 years. He noted that the \$30,000 is operating deficit based upon recent history. Mr. Blain noted that every year you are replacing equipment. Mr. Wolfe explained that one year we replace a pool pac unit, but another year we may only have \$50,000 worth of work. He noted some years you take a big hit and other years you take a small hit. He noted that the capital plan has listed the equipment and given it a life cycle and said that over a 20-year span, you will have to replace the fitness equipment every five years, HVAC system every 20 years and the total cost of that over time is a certain amount, and on an annual basis it averages to \$170,000. Mr. Seeds noted that would include the roof units.

Mr. Hawk questioned if it would come from income. Mr. Luetchford answered, in the early years the FC made positive money, but if we will ever return to those early years, it is unknown.

Mr. Seeds noted that the \$170,000 is for future needs and the replacement of equipment. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Board adopted a capital replacement plan for the FC, and in that plan, we have listed all of the existing capital equipment at the FC, given it a life cycle, and based the annual expenditure upon the life cycle of the equipment. He noted that is where staff came up with the \$175,000. He noted that Mr. Luetchford put together a replacement schedule based upon the equipment in the capital plan and it has the two pool pac unit's replacement immediately. He noted that they are the biggest component of the plan at \$600,000, but the average annual spend for the capital plan is \$175,000.

Mr. Hawk noted that he used to tell his accountant if he didn't bring it in the front door, he could not spend it out the back door so any improvements had to come from money that you bring in the front door. He noted that he would set up a sinking fund in order to make the necessary improvements, and that he needed to increase the income to make it happen. Mr. Hornung noted that is true if you consider this a business, like a profit making business. Mr. Hawk noted that it is his natural tendency to look at it that way. Mr. Crissman noted that the debt service extends out ten years and the refinancing will impact it. Mr. Wolfe noted that the refinancing does not affect the FC. Mr. Crissman noted that it will when the money comes over in terms of a loan... Mr. Wolfe noted that it is a different issue. Mr. Crissman noted when the bond issue is paid off that revenue will be available for the FC to use. Mr. Luetchford noted that we are paying \$380,000 a year for the debt service.

Mr. Wolfe suggested that you have to solve the first issue before solving the second issue. He noted that the Board must determine what it sees as the Township's involvement in the FC. Mr. Seeds noted that the FC must remain open by someone. Mr. Wolfe noted that you could close it. Mr. Seeds noted that is true but it is a huge plus for the Township to have it available just like the park system. He noted for him, it is not an option to close it. He noted that he wants it to remain open as a family-orientated facility. He noted that it is a huge plus to the Township to have it as it is good for real estate, and it is good for the economy.

Mr. Crissman suggested that we could eliminate some of the six options that Mr. Wolfe provided to the Board member. Mr. Hornung noted that the YMCA was mentioned and he questioned how they work. He questioned if they received contributions. Mr. Wolfe noted that they are a national 501 c (3), they receive donations and contributions and have endowments set

up. Mr. Hawk noted that they do fundraisers. Mr. Wolfe noted that building by building they are comparable to the FC operation but they have a network of these buildings and infrastructure that we can't compete with. Mr. Seeds noted in the 1990's we tried to get the YMCA interested in building a facility but they had no interest. He noted that he did not know if they would have any interest in doing it today, but it might be an option to talk to them.

Mr. Blain questioned Mr. Crissman what does the FCOB do and does Mr. Luetchford present these ideas to them. He questioned if they discuss the financial issues and what changes can be made to increase and improve the financial position. He noted that the Supervisors want everything to go through the boards or committees before they approach the Board of Supervisors and this seems to elevate directly to the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Crissman answered up until the options, the FCOB has seen and discussed everything we have discussed recognizing that the FCOB knows that it is an advisory body and can't take any official action to move anything forward; only to make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors. He noted when the Ballard King Report was commissioned, the FCOB took the recommendations and identified them and started to work on them. He noted as a member of the FCOB he has heard everything mentioned except for the six options presented to the Board this evening. He explained that he invited the FCOB to attend this meeting to listen and be a part of the discussion.

Mr. Blain questioned what their recommendation is. Mr. Crissman answered, in regards to increasing revenues it was the expansion of the facility. He noted they questioned what cost would that be and where would the money come from to do major renovations knowing that it would get kicked back to the Board as they don't have the operating funds in which to do that. He noted that the issue of the themed memberships has been under discussion for well over a year and staff has attempted to implement it on a limited basis to see if it would be profitable.

Mr. Crissman noted for the needed equipment, the FCOB asked Mr. Luetchford to put a long range plan together and it knows that the pool pacs need to be replaced at \$305,000 a piece, one this year and one next year. He noted that Township-wide, there are various committees coming together under the umbrella of fundraising so each of the committees have been asked to put together their wants and needs and send it to the Community Engagement Committee (CEC). He questioned if they have provided feedback to the Board. Mr. Luetchford answered no. Mr.

Crissman noted that fundraising has been an issue, how to do it, and if it should be separate and now with the CEC, it has moved to that level for discussion. He noted that they are very much aware of what is going on and concerned as well.

Mr. Blain noted that the FCOB is more inclined to say let's expand the fitness center and look at options for how it can increase programming. Mr. Crissman answered that is correct, even to the extent of saying to staff at budget time, do we need to raise membership rates in order to generate more revenue. He noted that they are trying to generate concepts that could bring in additional funds. He noted when you do comparative studies, that helps to lock in the membership rates in order to hold on to the membership because the Ballard King Report states there are two items that impact memberships. He noted that the first is generating new money, and the second is to find ways to maintain the existing money. He noted when people drop out at the end of a six-month membership; staff does a follow up to find out why they left. He noted that 20 to 30 memberships were lost and staff is in the process of recruiting and just got four memberships back

Mr. Hornung questioned why they are dropping their memberships. Mr. Luetchford noted that some of it is money and unemployment issues. He noted that some people move out of the area.

Mr. Crissman questioned Mr. Luetchford with the economy and membership being down, do you see any increase in the spikes for requests for scholarships for memberships or programming. Mr. Luetchford answered that scholarship requests have more than doubled in the last years. Mr. Crissman noted when the fund was started there was over \$20,000 and it has been reduced to \$11,000.

Mr. Seeds noted that the CEC is looking at foundations. Mr. Crissman noted that we started looking at it but when the CEC was created the FCOB backed off because it did not want to be in competition. He noted that the CEC may come up with any number of combinations noting that some of the smaller groups may not want to help raise the funds when they only need small amounts and the FC needs much more. He noted that the CEC may determine when certain groups can conduct fundraising items. Mr. Seeds noted that Mr. Wolfe mentioned an endowment as an option. Mr. Crissman explained that he learn last night something that ties into the YMCA that we could receive a contribution via the United Way. He noted if the FC had been

designated as a receiver from the United Way, people in the workplace or those who write a check to the United Way could designate that some of their funds be earmarked for the FC. He noted that many businesses try to get 100% of their people to give.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the FCOB is looking at a foundations. Mr. Crissman answered no because of the CEC.

Mr. Blain questioned if that would be doable as you would be giving money to the government. He noted that funds given to the United Way must be given to a non-profit organization. Mr. Crissman noted that he directed people to get that information for the FCOB.

Mr. Seeds noted back in the 1990's they asked the Central Dauphin School District to contribute \$500,000 to install an Olympic size pool for use by school teams, and Learn To Swim Programs. He stated that heard that Phase 2 of the Bishop McDevitt High School plan calls for a pool. He noted that there maybe opportunities in the future to partner with the schools and McDevitt since they are now located in the Township. He questioned if the pool makes money. Mr. Luetchford noted that we have had rental agreements with the School District and McDevitt before and would be glad to do it again. He noted that we now have Drayer as a partnership but we are always looking for possibilities for partnerships.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the schools use the pool now. Mr. Luetchford answered that they do not, as LPAC uses it during the prime time of late afternoon or early evening, but CD was renting the pool at 8:30 in the evening when the programming was done. He noted that they are not using it at this time. Mr. Seeds questioned if there are any future opportunities for partnerships with the schools that would help the FC.

Mr. Hawk noted that we have talked about ways to generate additional income, but what are we trying to accomplish. Mr. Wolfe noted that staff cannot answer that question as it is a Board question.

Mr. Blain noted that he would like to go back to Slide 2, noting that we have to discuss if the Board wants to continue to operate the FC and once that question is answered and if we do, what changes need to be made organizationally or to the facility. He explained that the FC is very good and a strong community asset and he would like to continue to see it operate but he is not sure if the municipality should be operating it and he would like to keep all options on the table. Mr. Hawk agreed. Mr. Blain noted that there are many non-profits that are very profitable

or have excess capital and produce the same result. He noted that the goal is to keep it closer together. He explained that he was told by a non-profit client who had income for the year not to use the word income; always use revenue over expenses.

Mr. Hornung questioned Mr. Luetchford if he wants to make it work. Mr. Luetchford answered that the Board built the building that is community orientated, but it was not built to be a profit making business, but to serve the community. He noted unless you change the nature of the facility, you can't have it perform directly as a business. He noted that you can make changes that can maximize the potential for revenues over expenses, and implement it and he stands ready to do that but he needs the Board's direction.

Mr. Seeds noted that the FC was built to be self supporting. Mr. Luetchford noted that was the intention at that time.

Mr. Blain noted that it was meant to be self supporting, but he is not willing to close the door to the other options. He noted that we have an opportunity to investigate other options to determine if there is a better way to operate the facility. Mr. Hornung noted that we must keep all options open. He noted if he had a group of employees who were not willing to go down the road, no matter how hard we try, it will not work.

Mr. Blain questioned if the difference between Option 1 and Option 6 is the idea that with Option 1 we do nothing different from what we are doing today and Option 6 would undertake the changes from the Ballard Spahr Report and doing the additional changes we initially talked about. Mr. Wolfe answered that Option 1 directs you to address the issue of the Senior Center and financial self sufficiency. He noted that was premises set forth by a group of people who had never done this and we accepted the premises and built the building on it. He noted that we almost made the premises but we are not there and we are not going to get there. He noted that Option 1 does not say status quo, but directs you to address the premises and come up with the true premise by which the facility will run and where the remaining money will come from, recognizing the Senior Center cost's must be funded appropriately. He noted that Option 6 is doing a wholesale reevaluation of the operational structure to consider structural changes within the facility to maximize revenues.

Mr. Hawk noted that he would like to try Option 6. Mr. Seeds agreed with Mr. Hawk. Mr. Blain noted that he does not want to settle on one option; rather we should look at various

options for instance leasing the FC to a private non-profit. He noted if we go about the process of reviewing it and approach the YMCA and talk to them about some of the things that they do, even if we don't decide to go down that road, at least we gather some intelligence on what they do and how they do it. He noted that he does not want to sell any options short. He suggested that that we should look at a couple of options.

Mr. Hawk noted that he is not partial to any one option, but questioned what the Board can do initially to see if it can come closer to end game. Mr. Blain noted if we were to look at other options like contracting someone to manage the facility or lease it to someone, he questioned if we should make any changes internally as the other organizations may want to do something completely different. He noted that he would like to review the options and spend some time digging into the options, to determine if there is interest for someone else to run the facility and how they would run it and what they would bring to the table. He noted that he would like to see what experience they can bring to us that can tell us if it would work or not.

Mr. Hornung noted that we must try our best to keep the FC open one way or the other. Mr. Blain noted that he is not saying to shut it down, we have a valuable asset, a physical asset that is very valuable, it's marketable, the revenue stream is not as marketable but there are ways to increase the revenue stream. He noted that he is not interested in transferring the management to an authority. He suggested that the Board would want to allow it to go out of its authority knowing that it is still an asset in the Township. Mr. Seeds noted that he would be interested in Option 3 and maybe talking to the YMCA. He explained that he wants to keep it as it is a family recreation facility.

Mr. Blain noted that he feels that the Board wants to keep the facility as it was initially designed to be, a family orientated facility that supports the community, but it is a matter of how to get where we want to be in regards to overall functionality, operational and fiscal management. Mr. Hawk noted that he does not disagree as long as we don't give an entity free reign to go in and run it. Mr. Blain suggested we should investigate some of the options and find out how it would work. He noted that we agree to invest \$1 million to upgrade the FC, and keep it as marketable as possible and you don't do that if you don't have the intent of keeping it as a long term type asset.

Mr. Hornung noted that he would like to look at having the YMCA run it and keep it family orientated, and to invest money into the FC to turn it around so it can make money. He noted that it would include revamping space to make money. He noted that he is not in favor of reformulating the purpose of it, noting that maybe \$100,000 contribution is not enough, but he is not ready to provide \$200,000 contribution or whatever it takes with the Township filling in the gaps. He noted that presumption for the FC to be self sufficient might need a little tweaking but not a gross adjustment.

Mr. Crissman noted that he supports Option 6 with a caveat that as we continue to move forward with the items that we discussed, the enhancement of revenues making areas, theme memberships, he would like to review the outsourcing of the management, the YMCA, to see proposals and collect the data to see if their proposals could show that they can do it better than our existing staff or let staff determine if it could implement the same changes to keep it all in house. He noted that he would prefer to keep it in house if at all possible with the best possible results financially.

Mr. Blain agreed. Mr. Crissman noted that he wants to see the comparative data. Mr. Blain noted that he agrees with Options 3, 4 and 6. Mr. Hawk noted options 3 and 6 are good. Mr. Crissman noted that he can't support Option 3 at this time, but he would support Option 6 at this time. He stated that he would like to have outside sources submit proposals to provide comparative data with what we are currently doing. He noted that we could opt to use the source or have in house changes made from those proposals. He noted that he would prefer to own and operate the FC successfully.

Mr. Seeds noted that he is for Option 3 but would like to look at Option 6.

Mr. Hornung noted that the Board members tend to prefer Options 3 and 6 but vary in the preference.

Mr. Blain noted that he is not tied to any option but he would like to investigate options 3, 4 and 6.

Mr. Seeds noted that you wouldn't want to do Option 6 if you knew you were not going to make changes if we were not the operator. Mr. Crissman noted that we can implement changes now. Mr. Blain noted if you go to the YMCA or whoever, they will want to do their due diligence in regards to whether this makes sense for them. He noted that they will want to review

the financial statements, operations, staffing and head count, operational times, equipment, and capital assets. He noted that they will come back with a proposal for what they will do and how they will do it and what the cost structure will be. He noted in the meantime, with Option 6, the Board should be doing its own Performa analysis, if we do these things internally for how much it will cost and how much revenue it will generate then we can compare Options 6 versus Options 3 and 4. Mr. Hornung noted that he would not be surprised if Options 3 and 4 would show that the Township needs to do certain things for them to take it over to make it profitable. Mr. Blain noted that we need to invest additional money into the FC for the pool pacs as no one would come in knowing that there is \$1 million worth of upgrades that need to be done.

Mr. Hornung noted that we will not continue to let the FC go the way it is going now, and we will investigate who would be interested in taking it over and what the resulting financials would be from that and what it would cost to upgrade the FC in an effort to make it more viable. Mr. Crissman noted that the first and third item Mr. Hornung stated was Option 6 and that is why he would like to start with Option 6 and then go to Options 3 or 4 to look for the outside. He noted that we need to be doing something now and that is Option 6. Mr. Blain noted that he would like to look at Options 3, 4, and 6 together at the same time and then do an analysis and compare the data to make the best decision. Mr. Blain suggested that we should be able to get through the process in the next 90 days. He noted that staff will be very busy in that time period because if you contact the YMCA, they will come in with a lengthy list of due diligence items that they want and staff will have to collect the data and be available for them. He noted that the Board needs to study Option 6 to determine what the Performa of operating the facility is if we make the changes. He noted that there may be a need for some help to do all of that. Mr. Luetchford questioned if the Board was okay with staff securing that help if needed. Mr. Wolfe noted that we need to do some initial outreach first and get back to the Board. Mr. Blain noted if we need to get some help in the next couple of weeks to get information that would help us in the future then we need to do that.

Mr. Crissman questioned if staff has enough information. Mr. Wolfe answered that staff knows where to begin. He noted that staff may need more direction after we start the process but he will start it and get back to the Board. Mr. Hornung noted that he would like to hear back from staff within the next 65 days. He noted that he is willing to provide help to Mr. Luetchford

and his staff to do this work. Mr. Wolfe noted that he will see what is required of staff and then he will know what assistance is needed. Mr. Wolfe noted that this will be an ongoing discussion for future meetings. Mr. Hawk noted that the bond issue will provide the money to buy the pool pacs. Mr. Wolfe noted that the bond is eight days out.

Mr. Hawk called for a short recess at 7:25 p.m. Mr. Hawk reconvened the meeting at 7:30 p.m.

Review of Township's stormwater management requirements, including
their application to building additions and in-fill development

Mr. Wolfe explained that he has a short presentation for the stormwater management requirements. He noted that it has changed significantly in the past couple of years and it has been a learning and growing experience for staff, one that we are not looking forward to or agree with. He noted that the Township is empowered to regulate land use activities that affect runoff by the Authority of the Act of October 4, 1978, the Storm Water Management Act. He noted that it provides the authority to manage stormwater in the Township.

Mr. Wolfe noted the Storm Water Management Act gives the Township the authority and requires it to manage runoff, erosion, and sedimentation by regulating activities; provide review procedures and performance standards, design criteria for storm water management; promote the utilization and preservation of existing natural drainage systems; manage stormwater impacts; and focus design and planning on infiltration of stormwater. He noted that keeping the water on the lot is now the current way of thinking and what the new regulations are intended to promote. He noted that the Township must maintain existing flows and quality of streams; meet the water quality of the Commonwealth that come from the Federal Clean Water Act; prevent stream erosion in banks; and provide for the operation and maintenance of all stormwater management facilities. He noted, while on Road Tour the Board discussed storm water facilities that are ten to fifteen years old that are not properly maintained. He noted that the new requirements won't allow that to occur anymore as the people will be required to maintain them and there will be operations and maintenance agreements for that function. He noted that the Township must identify controls to meet the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit requirements; implement an "illegal discharge detection and elimination program", noting that this has been done and is a great part of Mr. Miller's work; ensuring that the flood carrying

capacity for the stream and natural watercourses is preserved; that the drainage of low points along streets and other applicable areas; and provide positive drainage away from all structures.

Mr. Wolfe noted to do this work the Township gets to regulate regulated activity. He noted that it would include any earth disturbance activities or activities that involve the alteration or development of land in a manner that may affect stormwater runoff. He noted the regulated activities include, but are not limited to: Earth Disturbance Activities, Land Development, Subdivision, Construction of new or additional impervious or semi-pervious surfaces, construction of new buildings or additions to existing buildings, diversion or piping of any natural or man-made stream channel, installation of stormwater management facilities or appurtenances thereto; and installation of stormwater Best Management Practices (BMP). He noted that just about anything you can do on a lot; the Township can regulate it for stormwater purposes. He noted that he can regulate more with stormwater than the Uniform Construction Code (UCC). He noted under the UCC, we cannot regulate the construction of a utility building unless it increases the size by 1,000 square feet. He noted that is not what this act requires for stormwater purposes.

Mr. Hornung noted that some of this language is pretty strong, and he questioned if it is strong enough to allow staff to go on private property to correct a situation. Mr. Wolfe answered that it is and it isn't but he would get into that further. He noted that staff was given a model regulation from Dauphin County to adopt and all municipalities in Dauphin County were required to adopt them. He requested Mr. Fleming to address this issue.

Mr. Steve Fleming, HRG, Inc. explained that Dauphin County, under the supervision of the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), updated the Act 167 studies of local streams. He noted that part of the study was a model ordinance to regulate storm water which was tributary a to those streams. He noted that the model ordinance was to be consistent across the Act 167 studies and it was. He noted that Lower Paxton Township has three different Act 167 studies which impact the Township. He explained that the model ordinance from those studies was passed to the Township to adopt into the stormwater regulations. He noted that it occurred in December 10, 2010. He explained that the Township met the local requirement under the Act 167 Study to help Dauphin County meet their requirement with DEP for the Act 167 study.

Mr. Wolfe noted that staff has learned, in implementing the model ordinance we have adopted, it was written by an engineer as opposed to someone who writes ordinances and we found significant flaws which he would identify in a minute.

Mr. Wolfe noted that what staff is supposed to be doing in regards to impervious coverage, if there is new impervious coverage from zero to 1,000 square feet, it has to comply with the new regulations but it does not have to make a submission to the Township. He explained if someone causes a stormwater problem it must be corrected, but no submission is required to the township. He noted if it is between 1,000 and 5,000 square feet, the person must provide volume controls and a stormwater site plan and report. He noted over 5,000 square feet of new impervious coverage becomes a development activity for a commercial or institutional community, but not a homeowner issue, and that is the easiest area of compliance because anyone doing that work already has an engineer and is doing the design work and is educated on the process more so than what staff is.

Mr. Wolfe noted that where staff is having a problem is with the 1,000 square foot to 5,000 square foot on-lot additions of new impervious or additional impervious. He noted that it becomes very difficult to properly regulate it. He noted what is required is volume controls. Mr. Fleming noted it must address the two-year storm event with the applicant calculating the difference in stormwater runoff volume for the small storm event and then design some type of BMP either above or below ground to capture it and retain the runoff for the purpose of infiltrating it back into the ground. He noted that it is supposed to replicate the pre-development runoff condition in the development.

Mr. Wolfe noted that a BMP stands for Best Management Practice, and it is what you can do on your lot in the most economically fashion to satisfy the additional storm water and in many cases it is an infiltration trench.

Mr. Crissman questioned who would make that determination. Mr. Wolfe answered that the person presenting the plan to the Township has to design the facility using the most appropriate BMP. He noted to get further into this; you are required to provide a stormwater management plan as well, and, by law, it is required to be prepared by an engineer. He noted that a homeowner can't come in with an 8 x 11 sheet and show an infiltration trench on it to

constitute a stormwater management plan anymore. He noted that the state law says that it must be sealed by a registered engineer.

Mr. Wolfe requested Mr. Fleming to explain what a stormwater management report consists of. Mr. Fleming noted that it would consist of a project description outlining the site features both existing and proposed, and the technical calculations that estimate the runoff for existing and proposed site, and then design calculations for what BMP they are installing as part of the development. He noted that they will also have operations and maintenance procedures for the BMP area to provide longevity for the system.

Mr. Wolfe noted once you have done the volume controls and stormwater management site plan and the report, prepared by a registered engineer, you also have to enter into a maintenance agreement, a document that is required to be recorded at the Dauphin County Court House and provide an easement agreement, a recordable document, and financial security. He noted that you must have an inspection of the facility that you are installing by either Mr. Fleming or Mr. Miller.

Mr. Wolfe noted that it is not an easy or inexpensive process by any means. He questioned what would happen if we don't implement the plan. Mr. Stine suggested that the Township would be subject to enforcement action since it is required by PA DEP through Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). He noted that the EPA requires it and the DEP implements it. Mr. Stine noted that the EPA started it with the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4) Program. Mr. Hornung questioned if the EPA came up with the 1,000 to 5,000 requirement. Mr. Stine answered that he did not think they were responsible for that as the States are allowed to come up with their own plan.

Mr. Hornung noted if we implemented the plan, there would be an enforcement action at which point we would end up in court. He noted that it would be challenged as to what is appropriate. Mr. Stine noted that he did not know if it will be challenged to determine if it is appropriate, noting that they will be looking to see if you did it or you didn't do it. Mr. Hornung questioned if there would be a challenge as to why we didn't do it. Mr. Stine answered that it not what it would be.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the EPA has instituted site inspections of various municipalities in Pennsylvania and early last year Swatara Township was one. He noted that it was in a similar

state of enforcement as the Township, trying to figure out how to do this new set of regulations and they were fined \$160,000. He explained that they retained counsel and entered into negotiations with EPA and after six months entered into a consent agreement and paid \$50,000 and legal fees. He noted if the Township doesn't do this we could be liable for significant fines and penalties.

Mr. Hornung noted if someone puts a certain size swimming pool in their yard, they would part of this issue. Mr. Wolfe noted that this is Mr. Rice's issue. He noted that Mr. Rice installed a large swimming pool and patio area in his backyard, approximately 3,500 square feet and as a result incurred significant costs not only in putting in the facility but in the inspection of the facility.

John Rice noted that everyone is saying that it falls into the 1,000 to 5,000 square feet, which he understands, but he lives in an approved community that has a NPDES permit, and has a stormwater management system designed for the lot, as his neighbor down the street, whose backyards are 100 feet apart. He noted that they built a single family house with a garage and put a swimming pool in and they were not required to do a stormwater management system. He noted that he is 100 feet away living on an existing lot and was required to do one. He questioned why he is required to do one when the neighbor built a house and he wasn't required to do one.

Mr. Hornung suggested that maybe it was timing.

Mr. Fleming noted that he did not review the application for the house down the street but what he has been able to determine is that this ordinance applies to new impervious areas since the adoption of the ordinance, so he was able to get through because of timing.

Mr. Rice noted that it was a lot that was vacant. Mr. Stine noted that it was a planned lot. Mr. Fleming noted that there is another, which is not spelled out in the 5,000 and over chart for previously planned subdivisions that have retroactive approval under their stormwater management plan, so the improvements were improved as part of that plan. He noted that the subdivision had a home and driveway proposed in 1987 but it was never developed; therefore, they can use the previous plan approval for their stormwater management plan approval.

Mr. Rice questioned if the size of the house matters for the setbacks and the building envelope. Mr. Fleming answered that they would only have the protection for total impervious coverage that was assumed under that stormwater management plan. Mr. Rice noted that it

would be a percentage of the lot. Mr. Fleming answered that it may not necessarily be a percentage but a set amount of impervious coverage per lot. He noted that it was what that engineer proposed as part of the development. He noted that you would have to research that stormwater plan to find out if it was a percentage or an actual coverage amount.

Mr. Rice questioned if the responsibility is on the applicant and not on the Township that is triggering this as soon as you hand in your building permit for a pool. He noted as he understands the system for the Township, when you come in with a permit for a pool, Mr. Poluka sends it to Mr. Miller. He noted that as soon as he sees that it is over 1,000 square feet it gets returned and Mike Poluka called him and told him that he needs a stormwater management plan. Mr. Rice questioned if the Township has... he feels that the Township is not doing its due diligence if there is a stormwater management plan on file, for his lot, he would think that it is not the responsibility of the applicant as a homeowner, as opposed to a developer to be able to research that and understand how to do that. Mr. Fleming explained that Mr. Rice has to provide to the Township his stormwater calculations and to comply with the ordinance.

Mr. Stine noted it is just like any other permit. When the applicant files for a building permit, he is required to provide the building design in accordance with the UCC and the Township is required to review it and ensure that it complies. He noted that it is no different with stormwater.

Mr. Hornung noted that he may be able to go back and look at the original calculations done by the developer. He noted that it may have been done in two ways where the lot is allowed to have so much impervious coverage and if it was, he might be able to come under that umbrella. He noted that the other option is that they may have taken 25% impervious coverage for the entire development. He noted that they may not have used it all up, but the trouble is that you would have to hire an engineer to figure it out to determine if there is any left over that he may be able to use. He suggested that it would be pretty costly. He noted if it was broken down per lot, it might be a lot easier to say that he didn't use it all and there is still a certain amount of impervious coverage allowed and that he could use it. Mr. Stine noted that it would be allowed but it may be more costly to do that then doing a stormwater plan and putting in the improvements. Mr. Fleming noted that you would have to hire a professional to do the research to use that report to provide the information needed for the application.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the information would be in the Township building for the original development. Mr. Miller answered that it is a possibility depending on the age of the plan. Mr. Hornung noted if he found the engineer that developed it he might find an answer. Mr. Fleming noted that would be an option. Mr. Hornung noted that he would have to have a professional stipulate what he found. Mr. Fleming noted that once you are in that 1,000 to 5,000 square feet range, you have to have the plan prepared by a professional. Mr. Hornung questioned, if Mr. Rice found out who designed it, and they were a professional engineer, they could probably do that for a small fee to write a letter that he is within that impervious coverage for that lot. He noted that it might be a cheaper answer or it may not be.

Mr. Fleming noted his general experience with residential development, especially the older ones, the hypothetical scenario has been exceeded because the size of homes has grown over the years and people have added patios, driveways and overall impervious coverage. He noted while we could assume that there maybe additional impervious available, we could also assume that there is none.

Mr. Miller noted that most people do improvements with their property as time and funding allows at a later date. He noted that even a deck is considered impervious since gravel is normally put under it and it is considered to be impervious. Mr. Seeds noted that gravel is not necessarily impervious. Mr. Miller noted that the State has told us that it is. He noted if you take the example of a packed gravel parking lot, it will hold water and you can see puddles and over time, especially 2 A stone, there are significant finds there.

Mr. Seeds questioned how old Mr. Rice's development is. Mr. Rice answered that it was started back in the 1980's and there are probably 11 phases now and he is in the last phase. Mr. Seeds questioned if he knew the name of the development. Mr. Rice answered that Hunt Club Partners was the name of the developer. He noted that he is the third owner of the lot and there were probably ten different builders in the development. He noted that he bought the lot in 2005 and built the house in 2006, and was the third person on the deed.

Mr. Seeds asked Mr. Rice if he could find any records. Mr. Rice answered that he found the development plan through Dauphin County but there was no verbiage for the percentage of impervious cover allowed on the lot. He noted that he can't image that the page did not get recorded. Mr. Seeds questioned if an engineering firm was listed. Mr. Rice noted that he was so

far into the game as this point, his stormwater improvement guarantee was voted on, the money was gone and the work was done.

Mr. Seeds questioned if it was feasible to track down the engineer. Mr. Fleming answered that the plan would have a title block on it with contact information for the developer's engineer. Mr. Seeds questioned Mr. Fleming how long his office keeps their records. Mr. Fleming answered that they have a retention policy of five years. Mr. Rice noted that the development plan must be in this building. Mr. Stine noted that the Township might not have the stormwater management report.

Mr. Seeds questioned if Mr. Rice could come in and look for that. Mr. Rice noted what is done is done, but his issue now... Mr. Seeds noted that he is thinking for someone in the future. Mr. Wolfe noted that the short answer is that the Township will provide whatever we have for people to look at. He noted that subdivision plans that are 15 to 20 years old, the documentation is not way near what you would find in a file today. Mr. Seeds questioned what is required for today. Mr. Fleming answered that there may have been a report to go with the plan.

Mr. Hawk noted that Mr. Rice has a shot but it is a slim one. Mr. Rice noted that the work is done. He noted that it was in December of 2010 when it was adopted but back in May he made a Right-To-Know request to Mr. Wolfe for someone in Old Iron Estates who put in a swimming pool. He noted that it was 6454 McCormick Lane, and they did a stormwater plan in May and their improvement was for 1,572 square feet of new impervious so they got an engineer and did the plan and submitted their plan to Mr. Miller but they were not required to have HRG do inspections and not required... He noted that he has \$1,100 in bills from the Township. He noted that seven bills are for reviews and four are for inspections and he questioned why the McCormick Lane people were not put through the same process. He noted that they did not have to put up any money but were in the same bracket. Mr. Fleming answered that the McCormick Lane plan has 1,500 square feet of impervious coverage and they submitted as stormwater plan and went through Mr. Miller and he referred it to his office for concurrence and he sent it back to him. He noted that it was a much simpler plan, where as Mr. Rice's plan was for 3,700 square feet and had roof leaders, down spout connections systems and underground stone infiltration pit type that spread the water through that pit as well as an additional patio area. He noted that it was a much more complex project not only from a review standpoint, but also from an inspection

standpoint. He noted that there was more than one inspection as he was out there three times, once for the initial inspection, and he had to return to complete that inspection and then a final follow up visit to confirm that the final construction was completed as indicated on the second inspection report. He noted if you are proposing twice as much construction it will take twice as much time to review it to ensure it is done properly. Mr. Rice noted with all due respect, we were in the same envelope and he questioned why they were not putting up a stormwater guarantee as he was required to. He noted that complexity is not mentioned in the ordinance but the amount of impervious is what triggers the extra work.

Mr. Hawk explained that Mr. Fleming noted that it was timing. Mr. Fleming noted that was correct. Mr. Seeds questioned if the original development covered the McCormick Road case. Mr. Rice noted that it was five years old. Mr. Fleming noted that his comment was in regard to review time, and how many inspections were required; he was not required to do the inspections as he did not have an improvement guarantee. He noted that he reviewed the report and found it in conformance and after that part of the project he was not involved. Mr. Rice questioned why. Mr. Fleming answered that he works on an as needed basis for the Township.

Mr. Wolfe noted that we have more information for the Board members. Mr. Hawk noted that we did not solve your problem. Mr. Rice questioned why. Mr. Seeds questioned if there was some flexibility, was his plan more complex with the downspouts and so forth. Mr. Seeds questioned if there was something in the Act that triggers how far you go in the process. Mr. Fleming answered that there were structural improvements with Mr. Rice's project, pipes, roof leaders, but he does not recall the dynamic of the McCormick Plan; he believes that it was a smaller scale with a stone bed that was installed.

Mr. Stine noted that Mr. Miller has to evaluate if he is comfortable reviewing and inspecting a project as a non-engineering person. He noted that Mr. Miller is not a P.E and HRG may be called in if it is more complex than what he wants to get into. Mr. Seeds questioned if Mr. Miller has discretion... Mr. Stine noted if he believes that it is not within his capability to do it, yes he does. He noted that you don't want someone inspecting a plan if they don't believe it is within their capability to do so.

Mr. Wolfe noted that all the inspectors operate from the function that if there is something out of their ability or knowledge, that they will go to a third party. He noted that

building inspectors do that on a regular bases and third party agencies or consultants are a regular part of the enforcement process.

Mr. Hornung noted when you are speaking about 1,500 square foot, did Mr. Miller inspect it. Mr. Miller answered that he looked at the plan and then sent it to HRG for review. Mr. Hornung questioned if they were required to do a maintenance agreement. Mr. Miller answered that once it comes back from the review from HRG, it goes back to the Community Development Department and they look to see what improvements are being constructed such as a pool. He noted that he does not generally know when something is being constructed, as he does not do Community Development inspections. Mr. Hornung questioned if the Community Development Department is the one that required the maintenance agreement. Mr. Miller noted that it required by the ordinance but it didn't require one and the owner didn't obtain one. Mr. Hornung questioned Mr. Miller if he knew why. Mr. Miller answered that he did not know why. Mr. Miller noted that we have some things we have to work out internally within the system. He noted this is a separate subset of permitting and staff is working though the process as we look at the ordinance, starting to put the pieces to where they all need to go and where the responsibility will lie. He noted that we are working through an ordinance that is somewhat similar to chewing sand.

Mr. Hornung noted when someone mentions that one person has to comply with the rules and another one didn't, he questioned if someone slipped through, should we allow everyone to slip through. He noted that he can't use that argument either. He noted if one slips through, shame on us, but that doesn't mean that we won't go forward and plug those holes up as all of this was new to staff. He noted because one slipped through we should not let everyone else do that. He noted that staff had to develop the system as they implemented it. He questioned Mr. Rice if that answered his question. He noted that although it was a smaller project, we might not have done it as we should have.

Mr. Rice noted if it slipped through, he does not think it is fair. He noted that he has to write a check to the Township for \$3,200. Mr. Hornung noted that he does not know the answer and he will check into it. He noted that it makes him laugh when people say it is not fair; he defied Mr. Rice to show him anything that is fair. He noted that it is what it is and things happen, we are all infallible, and we go forward to try to do the best we can do. He noted if they made a

mistake they made a mistake and we go forward because we all make mistakes, but because we made a mistake on one doesn't mean we should repeat it further down the line. He noted that he is not even saying that we made a mistake as he has not had the time to look into it. He noted that we will check into it and that is the story. He noted when people come into him and they want an answer, he will give them the best answer he can give them, whether they like it or not. He noted, in the past, they usually say they respect him for that. He noted if we made a mistake we will fix it, however he is not ready to say at this point that the Township made a mistake.

Mr. Rice questioned if he could be provided with a detailed list of what he is being billed for by HRG. He noted that he is only getting billed for hours and for when the plan was approved and the one that he is getting billed... Mr. Hawk questioned if you get the bill from the Township or from HRG. Mr. Rice answered that the bill comes from Dianne Moran. Mr. Rice noted that he has not paid the bills yet because he does not know what they are for other than staff, professional staff and that is all they say. Mr. Hawk questioned Mr. Fleming if he could provide that information to Ms. Moran to give to Mr. Rice. Mr. Fleming answered if it is the pleasure of the Township he can do that. Mr. Wolfe noted that he will make sure it gets done.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he has more information on this topic explaining why there is confusion with this set of regulations. He noted if you would look at the proposed amendments, due to the complexity of the ordinance it has taken staff a while to go through it in regards to the concerns that it has. He noted that the first item is an email from Mr. Fleming to the Dauphin County Conservation District (DCCD) in regards to interpretation on two issues from DCCD. He noted that their answer was that the ordinance was drafted as part of the Act 167 Plan and given to the municipalities to adopt. He noted at the point of adoption, Dauphin County had met its obligation and they don't have an engineer on staff to comment on the changes. He noted that they provided some general guidance. Mr. Wolfe noted that staff believes that there are significant changes that need to be made to the module provided to the Township from Dauphin County through DEP. He noted that the proposed changes that will be presented to the Board will be made at your own peril in that we will not get the entities above us to give up their blessing that these amendments are necessary.

Mr. Stine noted that the ordinance refers numerous times to new or additional impervious surface but they don't define either term. He noted that additional is more than what you have

now but he questioned what is new. He questioned if you dig up your driveway and replace it in kind in the same spot it is new. He noted that we don't think that a person should have to get a stormwater permit to replace what was already in existence, using the same location and dimensions. He noted that we will propose a definition of new impervious surface and exclude from that when you are replacing something in the exact same location as before so it is clear that if someone's house burns down, and they have to dig up the foundation and put it back they don't have to do a stormwater management permit for putting back what they already had. He noted if you don't define new, technically it would be new impervious.

Mr. Stine noted for the enforcement provision, it states that you have to file a non-traffic citation for a summary offense, yet neither the Stormwater Management Act or the Second Class Township Code lists stormwater violations as a summary offense, it lists it as a civil proceeding. He noted that it is a different fine level and different enforcement methodology with the one exception that within the stormwater ordinance there are certain provisions that govern water pollution such as an illicit discharge into a stream or clear storm water system. He noted that would be a water pollution issue and it would be a summary offense. He noted when it was originally drafted; they made everything a summary offense which is not authorized. He noted that we have to correct it to ensure that it can be property enforced.

Mr. Seeds questioned if we are asking the State for clarification of their ordinance. Mr. Stine noted that they will not do anything; we have to do it in our ordinance. Mr. Fleming noted that the guidance they provided was to use the consultants to make reasonable interpretations of the ordinance. He noted that we have met on those two changes and it will not change the intent of the Act 167 study model ordinance but it will impact the way the Township's enforces it. Mr. Hornung noted that new will not mean additional. Mr. Fleming noted that the additional rendition on new and impervious would be changed. Mr. Stine noted that new is new except if you are replacing a driveway that is in bad shape. He noted if you excavate it, and put the exact same driveway in at the exact location using the same dimensions or area, then you don't have to get a stormwater permit for that. This holds true for a sidewalk or if your house burns down and have to dig up the foundation.

Mr. Hornung questioned, if for one year you put in a sidewalk and it is 600 square feet... Mr. Stine noted that the impervious coverage is cumulative for a maximum of 1,000 square feet

for life from the original. Mr. Wolfe noted that it would be from the adoption of the ordinance. Mr. Wolfe noted that it might sound like it is difficult to enforce, but we could enforce that through aerial photography. He noted that we have the dates for the aerial maps and what was there what wasn't. Mr. Seeds noted if someone puts in a sidewalk and then five years from now they want to build a garage, they could exceed the 1,000 square feet and staff won't know that. Mr. Stine answered that we will as we can keep track of it. Mr. Miller noted that we can keep track of it by address, and everything that is done with that address would be tied to it.

Mr. Seeds noted that we change some definitions in our ordinance. Mr. Stine noted that no one else will do it, we must do it. Mr. Seeds questioned if we would be okay with the State and Dauphin County. Mr. Stine answered that he did not see why not since the changes are not affecting the Act 167 Study and what its goal is.

Mr. Stine noted that Mr. Fleming is working with staff on this. Mr. Wolfe explained that Mr. Fleming has prepared a new definition for assumed impervious coverage. Mr. Fleming noted that he is still working on that one.

Mr. Wolfe noted that there are a significant amount of proposed amendments noting that Mr. Robbins and Mr. Miller have come up with a laundry list of necessary changes that go from basic formatting of the ordinance to areas of significant concerns.

Mr. Robbins noted that in terms of discharge that is the focus that caught his and Mr. Miller's attention since we are obligated to do this work under the MS4 requirements. He noted that there are six minimum control measures that the Township is obligated to do under the MS4 noting that an illicit discharge was not defined in the ordinance and the language for legal discharge was a little different. He noted his comments stemmed around sump pump and roof headers. He noted that roof connections were tied together so when you look at it you see roof header but you don't read the caption under roof header you won't find anything about sump pumps. He noted that he changed the caption to say roof header and sump pumps. He noted that there were many changes in how the document reads; noting that we met numerous times and read it and everyone all had their own interpretation. He noted that the document did not seem to flow well in certain sections. He noted with Mr. Fleming's knowledge and expertise he thinks we will have a better ordinance. He noted that the changes that he has incorporated will not weaken the Act 167 compliance or deviate away from it and it will make the ordinance more enforceable.

Mr. Miller noted when he reviewed the ordinance as a canned ordinance, there was a little expectation that it would be clean. He noted the more staff reviewed it, the more it noticed that it was not designed for ease of implementation or enforcement. He noted that he had two typed pages of comments, looking at it from a problem solving or enforcement capability as that is what he is charged with. He noted that he will be the person who has to interpret the ordinance when someone calls in and says my neighbor is doing x, what can you do to solve x. He noted that many ambiguous definitions needed to be clarified, one mention detention basin and another said basin detention, having two different definitions. He noted that staff wanted to clean up a lot of those items. He noted that it will help to put it in more plain language that we can understand and explain to the residents and enforce what needs to be while not subjecting us to fallout from the upper level government.

Mr. Crissman questioned when it would be brought to the Board for adoption. Mr. Stine noted that he is making all the changes at this time. Mr. Wolfe suggested that it will be discussed at the workshop in April and advertisement for adoption thereafter.

Mr. Robbins noted that Mr. Miller has worked tirelessly to come up with documents that would walk staff through the process for when someone comes in for an application as that is something that we are going to have to implement when we adopt the ordinance.

Mr. Miller explained that it will help to define rolls within the organization and try to fill all the stop gaps. He noted that it will have a flow chart to show if something occurs, it goes this way etc, and expands to what needs to be submitted with an application to prevent an applicant from making numerous trips to the municipal center. He noted that they will prepare a check list for the applicant. Mr. Robbins noted that it will be a collaborative effort for the Building Inspectors in the field, Public Works employees, and in-house staff. He noted that it does not lie only within the Public Works shoulders. He noted that we are responsible for enforcing it but in terms of implementing it, it will be a joint effort spanning numerous Township departments.

Mr. Crissman noted, at this point, the final approval would not occur before the May Board meeting and it may not be implemented until July 1st. Mr. Miller noted that the internal workings are not necessarily tied to the adoption of a clean ordinance. He noted that we have had a couple of meetings with staff and will change how the Township operates.

Adjournment

There being no further business, Mr. Blain made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Crissman seconded the motion and the meeting adjourned at 8:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Heberle
Recording Secretary

Approved by,

Gary A. Crissman
Township Secretary